## HAVLISH PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED MOTION FOR AN ORDER CREATING A COMMON BENEFIT FUND AND AUTHORIZING CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS THEREFROM

## EXHIBIT 4

```
1
    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 2
 3
    In re: Terrorist Attacks on
 3
    September 11, 2001
 4
                                        03 MDL 1570(GDB)(FM)
     ----x
 4
 5
                                           New York, N.Y.
 5
                                           April 15, 2010
 6
                                           11:30 a.m.
 7
    Before:
8
9
                        HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS,
10
                                           District Judge
11
                            HON. FRANK MAAS,
11
12
                                           Magistrate Judge
12
13
                              APPEARANCES
13
   COZEN O'CONNOR
14
14
        Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Insurance
    BY: SEAN P. CARTER
15
15
16 KREINDLER & KREINDLER LLP
16
         Attorneys for Plaintiff Ashton
   BY: JAMES P. KREINDLER
17
17
         ANDREW J. MALONEY, III
18
18 MOTLEY RICE
         Attorneys for Plaintiff Burnett
    BY: ROBERT T. HAEFELE
19
         JODI FLOWERS
20
    ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.
21
         Attorneys for Plaintiff Cantor-Port
21
22
    BY: JERRY S. GOLDMAN
22
23 HANLY CONROY
23
         Attorneys for Plaintiffs
    BY: ANDREA BIERSTEIN
24
24
25
                   SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
```

```
2
 1
     (Appearances cont'd)
    MELLON WEBSTER & SHELLY
 3
 3
          Attorneys for Defendants
 4 BY: THOMAS E. MELLON, JR.
 5
    KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.
 5
          Attorneys for Defendants Executive Committee
 6
              BY: MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
 6
 7
    PATTON BOGGS, LLP
 7
          Attorneys for Defendants
 8
    BY: MITCHELL R. BERGER
 8
9
     JONES DAY
9
         Attorneys for Defendants
     BY: MARY ELLEN POWERS
10
10
          TIMOTHY FINN
11
    JOSHUA L. DRATEL, P.C.
11
         Attorney for Defendant
12
    BY: STUART WHITE
12
13
    LAURO LAW
13
14
         Attorneys for Defendant
14 BY: JOHN LAURO
15
15
     STEVEN K. BARENTZEN, ESQ.
16
          Attorneys for Defendant
16
17
     SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROTHENTHAL, LLP
17
          Attorneys for Defendants
    BY: MARTIN SCHWARTZ
18
    WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY
19
19
         Attorneys for Defendants
    BY: ED REDDINGTON
20
20
21
   COBURN & COFFMAN, PLLC
          Attorneys for Defendants
    BY: JEFFREY COFFMAN
22
23
24
25
```

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

3 1 04F6MDLC 2 (In open court; case called) 3 LAW CLERK: All parties please stand and state your 4 name, starting with plaintiff. 5 THE COURT: We don't need to go through everybody. 6 The court reporter I think has everyone's appearance. 7 Let me, along with Magistrate Judge Maas, first 8 indicate where I think we are and talk about a schedule moving 9 forward. I have consulted with Magistrate Judge Maas and this 10 is what is going to happen and this is what I propose: First 11 of all, I will be issuing within weeks a decision or decisions, 12 and I am still finalizing how that is going to go, with regard 13 to 90 percent of the outstanding motions. Some of the motions 14 have separate issues and they are pretty much dealt with by 15 issues opposed to by individual defendant. You will be getting 16 that in the next few weeks. 17 In anticipation of that, this is what I would like the 18 parties to do: I am going to ask you to revise your proposed 19 scheduling order once you see my decision. You can start 20 talking about that now. I want you to revise it on a schedule 21 that will begin full-blown discovery as of the July 15th 22 conference that we will schedule from here. I am going to ask 23 you to submit that to Magistrate Judge Maas. 24 To the extent you agree on the schedule and to the 25 extent that you disagree, I want you to submit that to SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Magistrate Judge Maas by June the 14th. So I anticipate that in several weeks you will get the decision, digest that, and you will have time to see who is here, who is not here, and figure out whether or not the disagreements you have about scheduling, work out what you can, and propose it to Magistrate Judge Maas and give it to him by June 14th. So that I anticipate the schedule will begin after July 15 and, we will schedule the next conference for July 15th.

What I am going to you also to consider once you see that, the plaintiffs can consider whether or not you can file a consolidated or some consolidated complaints. I think we may still have 12, 13 outstanding complaints. Let's see as the smoke clears what the landscape is after you get the decision. Look and see whether you can do this in one complaint or consolidate it in one complaint or you can consolidate it in two or three complaints or something in that realm. If necessary, you can discuss that further with Magistrate Judge Maas or myself in the first instance. I think Magistrate Judge Maas will help on that issue.

See if that can be done given the committees that we have and the nature of the issues and maybe that can be done in one, maybe it can be done by different types of plaintiffs, different types of claims. You can evaluate what you think and it might be useful and efficient and even consult the defense with regard to that. It is really simply just a consolidation, SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

not an amendment. So we don't have to raise any new issues that will slow us down.

As soon as you get the decision, start taking about that, thinking about that and see if you can have some idea by June 14th of what you think might happen. If you need to go before Magistrate Judge Maas, he is going to set a conference before that time or after that time then you can address these issues with Judge Maas and get some assistance from him on that issue.

Then obviously given the decision on the motion there will be a lot of defendants that need answers. Try to make as early decision as you can whether there will be consolidated complaints. Get that to the parties and they can go ahead and answer. Obviously what I would like to see is that by July 15th the next scheduled conference that most of the decisions are done, we have a schedule to move forward with discovery, the complaints are consolidated that are to be consolidated, and the answers are in and you are moving forward. We're working on that and we'll be trying to work out.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MAAS: In light of what Judge Daniels has said and since none of us know when date the decision will come down, what I suggest is that within 10 days after that decision is issued the parties communicate with me in writing both as to any revisions they suggest with respect to SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

discovery. I have the letters that were sent in November. If everybody's position is essentially the same as it was, two lines saying that is fine. If there is some modifications, let me know. What I would suggest is that within 10 days of the decision, you communicate to me in writing both as to any tweaks of the discovery schedule and as to plaintiffs' thoughts regarding the consolidated complaint or complaints.

THE COURT: The June 14th date is basically what I determined where I think we are and where I think we will be. I think that is the latest date that we will be in a position to be able to get that done and have that all before Magistrate Judge Maas. In terms of a realistic schedule from my end, I think that is the outside date.

As Magistrate Judge Maas as indicated, I think we will be in a position to address those issues and resolve those issues before that date and have plenty of time before July 15th to resolve any issues that might be necessary to resolve in conjunction with or before we start moving forward with full-blown discovery. So the bottom line is so that everybody can gear up, both plaintiffs and defendants. That is when you should prepare to put aside some time and effort and for folks for start dealing substantively with discovery, fact discovery with regard to these cases.

That is the basic framework that I think that is going to guide us all. I think that over the next two months SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

substantial progress hopefully should be made.

Let me first hear from the plaintiffs and then I will hear from the defense whether or not with regard to those issues or whether they have other new issues that you want to address right now.

MR. KREINDER: Your Honor, I think that is fine with the plaintiffs. We look forward to the decision and we'll get to work as soon as we see it.

MR. KELLOGG: Your Honor, Michael Kellogg on behalf of the defense executive committee.

One question I would have is whether the Court contemplates that those parties be dismissed under the FSIA or personal jurisdiction or otherwise are going to receive partial judgments of dismissal so that any appeals can take place and they can be out of the case and not feel obliged to monitor discovery going on for a period of time?

THE COURT: That is my intent. I haven't made a final decision about that, but I have discussed that and I have considered that. My leaning at this point is that that will be done and that for those defendants who were dismissed out of the case I will probably enter judgment and or certified so that if the plaintiffs want to appeal they can on a different track, and the defendants can go ahead and dismissed out of the case can go ahead and get some finality within the Circuit with regard to those issues.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

I can tell you at this point that I have considered that and that is my inclination. The more I consider it and the more I look at what the landscape looks like that I anticipates after the decisions that is probably -- that is probably the way I am going on this. If I hear some objection, valid objections doing that, I think that it is most efficient and in everyone's interest to go ahead and resolve that as quickly as possible.

MR. CARTER: Your Honor, just briefly speaking to that issue, at the last conference we had dialogue with the court whether the plaintiffs would be permitted to amend their pleadings to cure any pleading deficiencies which may precipitate a dismissal in a particular case, and your Honor indicated that the plaintiffs would be allowed that opportunity.

So with regard to any potential final judgments or 54(b) judgments, I think we would just simply ask for the opportunity to let the Court know whether or not we want to pursue that with respect to a particular defendant.

THE COURT: Let me give some thought and some discussion over the next few weeks about what would be an efficient process for that. I think that I may set out a process that once you see the decision if you think that it is curable, then you at least give me some indication. I am not going to put you through the task of giving many a full-blown SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

9 proposal amendment complaint in those regards, but at least some fairly specific indication in what way it can be cured. 3 For example, there are certain issues we know are not 4 curable. If you have sovereign immunity, you have sovereign 5 immunity. It is not curable. I guess it is possible there may 6 be some allegations that could be made that might cure some of 7 the other issues if that evidence or at least those facts can 8 be raised in good faith. 9 I think what is appropriate is that I would say within 10 30 days of receiving decision, you should indicate to me and 11 the other side in writing which defendants and on which issues 12 you would seek to cure and at least some basis for me to 13 understand the nature of what you say would cure the deficiency 14 to whatever extent that you think it is appropriate for me to 15 review. So if you do that within 30 days of getting the 16 decision, I will give them an opportunity to quickly respond 17 and either before or at the latest by July 15th, you will have 18 permission to do that and/or I will deny it as futile and then 19 I will enter judgment by July 15th also that we can decide 20 whether or not we're in that posture still here or whether or 21 not that you will appeal to the Second Circuit. 22 So I think that that could still work within that 23 schedule and not delay progress to either party 24 MR. CARTER: Thank you, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: So anything else from the defendants? SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

I am confident that Magistrate Judge Maas and I are up to speed and did a significant amount of work to get us where we are now. I am confident that we can move forward efficiently on that schedule. I just want to make sure that everyone gears up. If there are any issues that you think that need to be addressed within that schedule to keep us on that schedule, bring them to my attention or Magistrate Judge Maas's attention in writing so we can resolve any issues.

My attitude moving forward is always particularly as to the next scheduled conference is always the same, my intent is that the conference is there to keep us on track and resolve any issues that need to be resolved to move us forward. And I think the most useful and the best thing that will give us both confidence is that if as we get close to July 15th, everything is done, geared up, ready to go and the parties say, Judge, there is no reason to waste our time bring to us in July 15th, we're ready to go, and after July 15th we're moving forward and then we'll schedule the next conference, as I said the standard six-month conference, and any other issues that need to be addressed regarding discovery with Judge Maas or any issues addressed with me directly can be address.

There are other related motions out there. I know there is at least, I believe, the National Commerce Bank motion that is still being renewed and will be submitted until June 18 or somewhere around there. There are some other minor issues SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

or motions -- I will not call them minor -- other motions, default motions and those kinds of things.

Let me just say this and I will volunteer this at this point just as guideance about the default: Given the nature of the issues with some of the defendants, I put off granting default motions for awhile until we gear it up. Think about what default means and what may have to be done following a default motion with regard to establishing the basis for recovery and establishing the damages and those kinds of things. Default motions may be a significant amount of work and attention by you.

It may not even be appropriate to move forward with any hearings or other related activity with regard to the defaults until some substantial discovery has been accomplished because it may be very well what the final determinations and the final default judgments to be issued. As you move forward think in terms of how what might will be an efficient process to deal with that, when might be an appropriate time to deal with that, and what would be necessary in order to really effect the judgment in support of default motion.

So put that to the side thinking about some issues how to handle that, but I think that I've been convinced that it is more appropriate for the opposite in most cases to let the default issues at least consider what is going to be relevant in the discovery process after some extent there are certain SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

2.4

defendants that it is appropriate to issue a default judgment without any further hearing or any further activity. That is the case.

I still haven't resolved whether or not if there are other issues that arise with regard to the defendants that particularly, the jurisdictional issues and how I have to address that and whether I need to address that sua sponte or raise those issues with the parties to convince me separately that it is otherwise appropriate to enter a default judgment against a particular defendant.

I just raise that issue now so as you think about this process, think about what you want to do with that. I don't want as I say to have the tail to be wagging the dog here. So we may find out that we have to submit activity on the default and it will complicate the discovery process as you go forward. So think about those things.

Rest assured we've been all working diligently to get this moving up to speed. Hopefully we can all work cooperatively, professionally to move this efficiently along. So I will anticipate that this is the schedule and it should be major activities as we go toward the end of the year into the next year.

Any other things that arise, if something we need that this raises that you think you should be thinking about or issues, bring them to my attention or Magistrate Judge Maas's SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13 attention as early a possible so we can keep this moving along. What I will do is otherwise see you July 15th. And unless you tell me. Judge, we don't need to see you July 15, everything is done, let's move forward. Again, it is always helpful for us if as we get closer to July 15th conference, indicate what issues if we have issues that you want resolve at that time or before that time, my attitude is try to resolve it before that time so if it can be done otherwise we can be prepared to discuss it further or resolve it at that time. MR. MELLON: Your Honor, on an unrelated matter but on the subject of not needing discovery but on the subject of ready-to-go, on July 15th one the Hanly lawyers Mr. Richard Haily addresses the Court and Mr. Haily advised the Court that the Hanly lawyers were ready to file their proofs against the Islamic State of Iraq. However, the Court directed us to give the Court status report regarding our service of process. I would like to advise the Court that on October 27th Mr. Richard Haily and the other Hanly lawyers did in fact send a very, very lengthy letter to the Court which is not on the docket because on December 27th, 2007, we do have the exhibits in great detailed showing the clerk certification of service as it pertains to Iran and all the instrumentalities. Again, we apologize for sending such a long letter, but essentially it was a repeat of the December 27th, 2000 clerk certification. I mention this, your Honor, because we have a bump in

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

the road. As we were getting ready to file our proofs, which are affidavits, videotape, testimony from Europe, etc., etc., Judge Royce Lamberth, Chief Judge of the District Court in Washington D.C., issued what we regarded as a landmark opinion regarding Iraq. In that landmark opinion the Judge said that under 1605(a), the amendment to FSIA that that was the way to proceed. It is a burden of proof matter.

SO accordingly, your Honor, we went back to the drawing board and on March 1st of this year we had filed a motion for leave to file our amended complaint under 1605(a). I believe Judge Lamberth made clear THAT this is not a new service issue. Not new defendants. It is just a burden of proof issue. So we would ask the Court to please consider our March 1st motion, motion to leave to file a complaint, our third amended compliant under the amendments of the FSIA.

Here is why: As soon as your Honor gives us the green light, we are in fact filing our proofs. I think at the last conference the Court said maybe there be a hearing, maybe there won't. The Court wanted to see the proofs. If you will entertain that motion, we will file our proofs immediately thereafter, which gets me to the second reason I would like to address the Court.

When whether Richard Haily addressed the Court
March 15th announced that he was hoping to file the proofs but
for this September 30th opinion that we didn't know about, one
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

counsel objected, which we weren't expecting. The objection was that all our proofs against Iran, which are videotapes, testimony, expert affidavits, should be filed under seal. We never heard of that. Since time of talk, we investigated 35 cases against the Sovereign State of Iran in federal court here in New York and Washington D.C. There has been no case ever filed under seal. We have looked at local rules under federal law regarding filing something under seal and we frankly don't understand and can't conceive of it.

So I would ask the Court, since the Court ruled from the bench, to consider that now or permit me to file a motion to address that issue because it just doesn't seem appropriate given the subject matter, the nature of American courts to file any evidence under seal unless it is a matter of utmost concern, criminal case or something of that sort.

So that is a request for clarification about the under-seal issue that was raised and a request that our March 1st motion be considered.

THE COURT: This is what I am going to ask you to do: I would like you to, one, consult with the other plaintiffs, appropriate plaintiffs attorneys about what you want to do now that everyone has considered the full-blown discovery and we're going on this schedule. I would like you to give me a letter as early as possible before against the June 14th date that I have given everybody else indicating that you consulted SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

appropriately with other plaintiffs so I know whether or not you are in agreement what you want to do. If you are not in agreement, say you are not in agreement and they can respond to the letter separately.

Then send me that letter so that the defense can respond to that letter. So if anybody has any objections with regard to sealing and unsealing or anything else, defense or plaintiff, then I will know that, although they are not technically the parties being represented here, we can consider whether or not any name that we might contemplate might adversely affect the conduct of the proceedings for others and.

Then you can either specifically reaffirm your position with regard to moving forward and how to move forward with your motion and/or modify it in whatever way you want to modify it or tell me what your position is.

MR. MELLON: Thank you.

 THE COURT: That is one of the things on my list right in front of me. I usually don't like to give you a question, I like to give an answer. I know that we have to address that and that was one of the things I had in mind and had its own separate issues when I raised the issue in January of defaults and what is the appropriate way to proceed.

MR. MELLON: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. KREINDER: Your Honor, this is an issue I have been involved in. I think I can save everyone a little time.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

First of all, the plaintiffs committee has no objection to Mr. Mellon filing an amendment to his complaint. The 3 plaintiffs committee that represents the families of 3,000 4 people who were murdered, thousands of people who were injured, 5 and billions of dollar in property damage does oppose any lawyer who represents less than 1 percent of the plaintiffs 7 group doing something that disadvantages all of the plaintiffs 8 in our opinion for reasons I can spell out at greater length. 9 The issue of actually recovering money from any of the 10 seven state sponsors of terrorism, involves litigation in 11 federal courts. It involves litigation such as we saw Libyan 12 Claims Resolution Act and involves diplomatic concerns. 13 All I will say on that topic now in open court is for 14 the reasons your Honor mentioned we oppose any single plaintiff doing something that 99 percent of the plaintiffs disagree with 15 for really very well thought out reasons. I agree with 16 17 Mr. Mellon completely, Judge Lamberth's opinion is an 18 absolutely just reading. The thrust of it, and he is handling 19 all the litigation against Iran other than this case, is when 20 he surveys the \$7 billion in judgments that have been rendered 21 against Iran and takes account of the legislative changes that 22 were designed to facilitate recoveries and particularly to 23 facilitate punitive damages recoveries, he laments the 24 litigation posture of this case because none of the people who 25 have preceded to judgments against Iran have in fact gotten SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

18 1 paid. 2 Of the seven sponsors of terrorism, the only 3 plaintiffs who have been paid are the plaintiffs I've been representing for 21 years in the litigation against Libya. I 4 just thought it saves the time of letter exchange, we vigorously oppose the hair on the tail of the dog doing something that we think could kill the dog. 7 MR. MELLON: Your Honor, may I respond? 8 THE COURT: Sure. 9 10 MR. MELLON: Thank you. Mr. Victor Saracini was the captain of the United 11 12 Flight 175, that is the second plain, the South Tower, his wife 13 and 60 or 70 other decedent families representing hundreds of 14 claims have been vigorously, persistently, intensely looking 15 not at Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia, not at airplanes, not at 16 skyscrapers, not all the other plaintiffs, not all the other 17 concerns, none of that. They have had one objective in 10 18 years and they are now ready to show this Court the results of 19 their extraordinary effort. This is not a matter of 1 percent versus 99 percent. 20 21 This is a matter of the truth coming out. This is not a matter 22 of diplomacy, or whatever Mr. Kreindler has in mind. This is a 23 matter of a Court looking at evidence and making an appropriate 24 determination. Because counsel may not be ready because they 25 have a bigger fish to fry should not prejudice Mr. Victor SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

agree on that, after I know you have consulted them then you can submit it to me. 3 MR. MELLON: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: I would rather have them see it before I 5 see it as opposed to submitting it to me and then sharing. 6 MR. MELLON: Thank you. THE COURT: I understand everyone's legitimate 7 8 positions and concerns and I will do my best and Magistrate 9 Judge Maas has been doing his best to accommodate. Our intent 10 at this point having picked this case in the posture we picked 11 it up in is to give everyone a fair and reasonable effective 12 forum to resolve these disputes. And although we have a lot of 13 lawyers here, we recognize that these are individual disputes 14 between individual plaintiffs and individual defendants. We're 15 mindful of that. 16 I think that most of the issues that you have raised 17 we've given consideration to. We don't have all the answers 18 yet either, but I think that we're in a process that we will be 19 able to move forward and resolve these issues efficiently step 20 by step and with regard to the ultiamate issues that are 21 involved in these cases. 22 We will gear up and be ready to go. We'll see you on 23 July 15th. 24 Is afternoon a better time than the mornings? 25 MS. BIERSTEIN: Your Honor, at least for me I know SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

21 morning would be better. I am going to be traveling later that day so morning would be preferable. 3 MR. KREINDER: Your Honor, the only thing I would say 4 is a couple people fly into town so starting at 10:30 or so. 5 THE COURT: Let's say 10:30 on July 15th. 6 As I say, let's try to resolve as many issues, if not 7 all issues, before that time so we can know that confidently we 8 are ready to move forward on this schedule. I think that we 9 should be on track by that date. 10 Again, if you have any issues that we haven't 11 contemplated, let us know and we'll factor those in in the 12 meantime. 13 Anything else? 14 MR. MELLON: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: See you on the 15th. 15 16 000 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.